

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 14, 16, and 17 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention, namely more clearly defining the first information and the second information. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over lida (USP 6,785,023) in view of Myers (USPGP 2002/0052940). Applicant traverses this rejection because 1) there would not have been any suggestion for combining Myers with lida, and 2) even if the combination were deemed proper for argument's sake, the combination would not have disclosed or taught at least generating a file that includes second information that cause the display unit to display a setting screen for setting at least the power status of the plurality of functions.

Independent claims 1 and 8 now call for, *inter alia*:

- (1) generating a file including second information that causes the display unit of the external apparatus to display a setting screen for setting at least the power supply status of the plurality of functions of the information processing apparatus;
- (2) transmitting the file to the external apparatus;
- (3) receiving from the external apparatus function information indicating at least one function selected via the setting screen displayed on the display unit of the external apparatus, based on the second information; and
- (4) controlling the power supply status to the apparatus required for at least one function indicated by the received function information.

lida discloses a network facsimile apparatus that generates a file that causes a display unit of an external apparatus to display the power status information. Although the file disclosed in lida also includes setting information, it is for setting the network facsimile apparatus rather than remotely controlling power supply of the network facsimile apparatus, as recognized by the examiner. In this respect, the examiner relies upon Myers for the proposition that remotely turning

on and off multiple components from an external device in lida would have been obvious.

Applicant disagrees with the examiner's assessment of the combination for the following reasons.

Myers indeed discloses remotely controlling power supply to individual components. As lida, however, does not disclose or suggest that its' client machine 202 sets the operating state, namely the power supply state, of the network facsimile apparatus 201, the combination urged by the examiner would not have been tenable. Neither lida nor Myers simply disclose or teach that its information processing apparatus provides the second information to the external device so that the display unit of the external device displays the setting information for setting the power status of the plurality of functions. As lida does not call for providing the second information, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found any motivation for the combination urged by the examiner. Applicant thus submits that the combination would not have been proper.

The examiner alleged that lida discloses generating a file including second information that causes the display unit of the external device to display setting information for setting at least the power supply status of the plurality of functions, relying on the passages set forth in column 3, lines 51-55, column 4, lines 11-19, and column 5, lines 4-14. No so. lida merely discloses in column 3, lines 51-55, that the HTML file generating section 11 converts the status of the plurality of functions in the scanner 5 or the printer 6 into the HTML file, discloses in column 4, lines 11-19, that the client machine 202 merely browses a homepage prepared by the network facsimile apparatus 201, and discloses in column 5, lines 4-14, that the WWW server section 12 communicates with the WWW browser operating at the client machine 202. None of these passages or elsewhere indeed disclose or teach providing second information that causes the display unit of the external device to display a setting screen for setting at least the power supply status of the plurality of functions.

In short, lida merely discloses that its client machine 202 displays status of the plurality of functions of the network facsimile apparatus 201, but fails to disclose that its client machine 202 sets the operating state, namely the power supply state, of the network facsimile apparatus 201. Because lida fails to disclose providing/transmitting the second information, lida fails to disclose or teach the above-outlined claimed features (1) to (4).

Myers discloses that its UPS 70 controls whether to power on or off the components 32a-32c based on the information received from its wireless devices 15a-15c. But Myers merely discloses transmitting information regarding whether to power on or off the components 32a-32b from the wireless device to the UPS. Thus, Myers also fails to teach providing the second information as set forth in independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, even if the combination were deemed proper for argument's sake, the combination would not have disclosed or taught the

claimed invention since none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught providing the second information.

Moreover, since Myers discloses controlling whether to power on or off of the components 32a-32b by transmitting a predetermined information from the wireless devices 15a-15c to the UPS 70, the wireless devices 15a-15c would need to know what information should be transmitted to the UPS 70 to control a particular component to be powered on or off. In the claimed invention, since the external apparatus receives the second information from the information processing apparatus, selects at least one function via the setting screen displayed by the display unit of the external apparatus, and transmits the information indicating the selected at least one function to the information processing apparatus, there is no need for the external device to know what information should be transmitted to the information processing apparatus to control a particular function to be powered on or off. Therefore, according to the claimed invention, it is possible to control the power supply to the plurality of functions even if the external apparatus does not know what information should be transmitted to the information processing apparatus to control a particular function to be powered on or off. This simply cannot be achieved from the combination of Iida and Myers.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)

27 MARCH 2007

DATE